

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on November 14, 2006. Claim 1 is amended such that claims 1-7 and 9 are now pending in this application.

Error on the Office Action Summary Page

Applicant would like to point out that there is no claim of priority under 35 USC 119 in connection with the present application. Accordingly, it is believed that reference to such priority on the Office Action Summary Page was made in error.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roman (The International Society for Hybrid Microelectronics (ISHM) Symposium Proceedings, October 1992, (October 1992), 1-6). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *M.P.E.P.* '2131. To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose every element of the challenged claim and enable one skilled in the art to make the anticipating subject matter. *PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp.*, 75 F.3d 1558, 37 USPQ2d 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant initially notes that Roman does not appear to teach or suggest bonding a first contact that is on a motherboard to a second contact that is on an electronic package where the electronic package includes a die mounted on a substrate. Applicant further notes that Roman only describes die attachment procedures instead of bonding an electronic package that includes a die to a motherboard. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Roman does not teach or suggest “engaging a first contact on a motherboard with a second contact on an electronic package that includes a die bonded to a substrate, . . .” in combination with “bonding the first contact to the second contact . . .” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-7 and 9 depend from claim 1 such that these claims incorporate all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Roman does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 2-7 and 9 for at least the reasons provided above with regard to claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 and 9 are respectfully requested.

Reservation of Right to Traverse Statements in the Office Action

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the pending rejections, and reserves the right to traverse any statement that was made in the Office Actions relating to the pending rejections. Applicant is expressly not admitting to any assertions that were made in any of the Office Actions.

Reservation of Right to Swear Behind References

Applicant reserves the right to swear behind any references which are cited in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(a), 102(e), 103/102(a), and 103/102(e). Statements distinguishing the claimed subject matter over the cited references are not to be interpreted as admissions that the references are prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((262) 646-7009) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DAEWOONG SUH

By his Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(262) 646-7009

By / Andrew Peret /
Andrew R. Peret
Reg. No. 41,246